must take action was mandatory. Accordingly in the closing days of the session, the members of the Legislature had to toe the mark and vote either for or against the law.

The reasons adduced in debate by the advocates of the law to fortify their position, except as a matter of history, do not interest us now. In brief, the missioners argued that no better law could be had 5 that a grievous mistake would be made in not accepting it, and that independence meant sacrifices which the people should be ready to make. The reasons advanced in debate in criticism of the law were summarized in the concurrent resolution which formally declined to accept the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act, and in the memorial laid before President Roosevelt by the President of the Philippine Senate. Bluntly stated, the Philippine Legislature rejected the law in the belief that it fell short of meeting national aspirations. The objections on which this proposition were planted as announced in the concurrent resolution were: (i) the provisions of the law affecting trade relations between the United States and the Philippine Islands would seriously imperil the economic, social, and political institutions of the latter country, and might defeat its avowed purpose to secure independence for the Philippine Islands at the end of the transition period; (2) the immigration clause is objectionable and offensive to the Filipino people j (3) the powers of the High Commissioner are too indefinite, and (4) the retention of military and naval reservations by the United States are in-

consistent with true independence, violate national dignity, and are subject to misunderstanding.

A concurrent resolution accepting the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act failed of passage in the Philippine Senate. Thereupon, on October 17, 1933, tne Philippine Legislature went on record as declining to accept the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act in Concurrent Resolution No. 46.

The same resolution above referred to authorized a joint legislative mission and named its members. The omissions